United Nations PBC/2/BDI/SR.2

Peacebuilding Commission

Distr.: General
17 January 2007

Original: English

Second session
Burundi configuration

Summary record of the 2nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 5 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. Løvald ..... (Norway)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda

Introduction by the Deputy Secretary-General

Adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism of the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

07-62664 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

1. **The Chairperson** said he took it that the Commission wished to hold an open meeting, in accordance with its practice at previous meetings.

2. *It was so decided.*

Adoption of the agenda (PBC/2/BDI/3/Rev.2)

3. *The agenda was adopted.*

Introduction by the Deputy Secretary-General

4. **Ms. Migiro** (Deputy Secretary-General) congratulated the Government of Burundi, its partners in Bujumbura and the Burundi configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission for their work over the last year to consolidate peace in Burundi. She recognized the invaluable convening and facilitating role played by the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB) under the leadership of the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General. In particular, she congratulated Burundi on its commitment to achieving peace through ongoing dialogue and inclusive consultations, and commended the tremendous efforts of the current Government in that regard.

5. The endorsement in June of the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi and the adoption at the current meeting of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism of the Strategic Framework were critical steps for Burundi and its people and also for the work of the Commission. The Framework identified the critical challenges still facing Burundi, including issues related to good governance, the Comprehensive Ceasefire Agreement between the Government and the Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu-Forces nationales de libération (PALIPEHUTU-FNL), security sector reform, justice and human rights and socio-economic recovery. The Strategic Framework and the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism would strengthen the long-term international support and engagement that Burundi needed.

6. The Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism jointly developed by Burundi and the Commission was the first of its kind. It paved the way for a principled and active partnership between countries under consideration by the Commission, the United Nations system and the international community. It was a practical, powerful tool to ensure dialogue and enhanced coordination between key stakeholders. Moreover, it would help ensure the accountability of those engaged in supporting Burundi in its efforts to achieve peace and sustainable development, including the Government of Burundi, the members of the Commission, the United Nations country team and other international partners in Burundi, the private sector and civil society organizations.

7. The adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism further deepened the Commission's engagement with the Government and people of Burundi. That engagement would be guided by the principles of national ownership and open and transparent partnership, as reflected in the Strategic Framework and the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism being adopted. The United Nations system, principally through its presence on the ground and the Peacebuilding Support Office in New York, would spare no effort to support that critical process.

Adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism of the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi (PBC/2/BDI/4)

8. **The Chairperson** said he took it that the Commission wished to adopt the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism of the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi, as contained in document PBC/2/BDI/4.

9. *It was so decided.*

10. **Mr. Mahmoud** (Executive Representative of the Secretary-General) said that the Government of Burundi and the Commission, in their joint development of a Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism to review progress in the implementation of the Strategic Framework, had been guided by a number of principles: ownership of the process by the Government and Burundi-based partners; identification of indicators for measuring progress in political and strategic areas critical to peacebuilding; and selection of a limited number of indicators with real strategic significance.

11. The process of developing the Mechanism had been as important as its adoption by the Commission. A joint task force composed of the Government, national partners, international partners and BINUB had developed it on the basis of the experience and lessons learned from the consultative process adopted to

develop the Strategic Framework. The intensity and level of exchanges with the Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office during that process had led to a mutually-owned process and a high-quality set of indicators. Burundi was breaking new ground in the area of monitoring peacebuilding, and he looked forward to the partnership with the Commission in that effort.

12. It should not be expected that indicators linked to peacebuilding would be as easy to measure as project indicators, as they were often multidimensional. Nonetheless, the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism furnished a good set of indicators and benchmarks for gauging the implementation of the Strategic Framework. The Mechanism recognized that peacebuilding involved many setbacks and few successes and sometimes required patience as countries developed the capacity to sustain peace on their own. Thus, the Mechanism was a tool that could be improved and adapted as implementation advanced.

13. It was time to expedite the process of implementing the Strategic Framework and quickly demonstrate the added value of the new tool. Burundians were already addressing their peacebuilding challenges, as the most recent developments illustrated. The Strategic Framework had the potential to become a powerful tool to galvanize political efforts around peacebuilding priorities.

14. As members of the Commission were aware, the Government of Burundi had established the Partners Coordination Group to monitor both the Strategic Framework and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). It was expected that the Group would be operational later that month.

15. Future activities and meetings of the Commission on Burundi should be guided by the Strategic Framework and the key principles should be kept in mind. The Mechanism just adopted would strengthen the ongoing endeavours of the United Nations for a truly comprehensive and inclusive partnership that would help strike a balance between national ownership and external assistance as it endeavoured to support Burundi's progress in consolidating peace.

16. **Mr. Shingiro** (Burundi) said that his delegation attached great importance to the Mechanism and welcomed its adoption, as it would enable the Government and the Commission to monitor implementation of the Strategic Framework. The adoption of the document marked the beginning of the operational phase of the Framework, and he hoped that all stakeholders would seek to ensure that it became a reality on the ground.

17. **Mr. Dhaene** (Belgium) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the Mechanism, which established specific criteria to guide the work being done at Headquarters and in the field. The Commission should be kept abreast of developments in Burundi so that it could respond actively and flexibly and meet national and international expectations. The Mechanism and the criteria were merely tools for guiding peacebuilding efforts; thus, the preparation and discussion of the planned reports should not become an end in itself, but should further progress in peacebuilding. Moreover, the mechanism and criteria should be adapted if necessary.

18. **Mr. Oshima** (Japan), said that the Commission could make a concrete contribution by pursuing an integrated strategy and mobilizing all resources in support of stakeholders. Peacebuilding was multifaceted and involved many stakeholders with different expertise and capacities. The challenge was to focus all those efforts on helping Burundi achieve sustainable development. The real challenge before the Commission was to ensure that the Strategic Framework was implemented, respected and supported by all stakeholders.

19. It was of utmost importance to identify how the indicators specified in the Mechanism were being met and to identify shortcomings and the actions needed to fill any gaps. His Government was willing to provide any support needed for such remedial action, and urged others to do the same.

20. The Mechanism was an evolving document that would be reviewed and improved. The question of indicators for monitoring progress was of particular importance, as was the commitment of all United Nations organizations, programmes and funds, although that was not explicit in the document.

21. The administrative burden of the Government of Burundi should be minimized. Close coordination was needed between the Mechanism and the parallel monitoring mechanism for the PRSP. National reconciliation should be accelerated, so that the Mechanism could be utilized effectively.

22. **Ms. Ribeiro Viotti** (Brazil) said that her country considered the Mechanism a useful complement to the Strategic Framework. It would also serve as an early warning system and a powerful tool to guide current and future endeavours by indicating gaps and prompting stakeholders to take action.

23. The Mechanism should not place an additional burden on Burundi but should play a role in facilitating and coordinating aid received. The fact that it was based on existing instruments and had been developed in tandem with the PRSP pointed in the right direction.

24. The Mechanism should also serve as a means of gauging the Commission's own progress in assisting Burundi. The commitments made by the Commission and listed in the matrix of indicators should guide its pursuit of concrete achievements. The fact that the matrix of indicators and benchmarks had been conceived as a living document was also positive, as it would enable the Commission to respond flexibly to evolving needs on the ground and reflected the fact that the peacebuilding was a dynamic and multifaceted process involving political, institutional and economic aspects. However, economic and development indicators could be better reflected in future versions of the document. The consolidation of a resilient peace depended upon economic and social development and effective measures to combat poverty.

25. Her delegation hoped that the achievements to date would inspire yet more ambitious results that would benefit the people of Burundi and demonstrate how the Commission could make a real difference to the countries under its consideration.

26. **Mr. Deruffe** (France) said that his delegation agreed with many of the comments already made, in particular those relating to the fact that it was time for the stakeholders to enter an operational phase, supported by the Peacebuilding Commission in New York; the need for the Commission to be much better informed about developments on the ground; and the importance of ensuring that the Partners Coordination Group did not create additional layers of bureaucracy for a Government that had many other priorities to address. He welcomed the comments made by the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General in that regard. His delegation hoped that the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism would be not an abstract bureaucratic exercise, but rather the means by which the commitments made by the Burundian Government and its partners would be translated into reality and peace built in Burundi.

27. **Mr. Valenzuela** (European Community) said he welcomed the fact that the Partners Coordination Group would be responsible for monitoring the implementation of both the PRSP and the Strategic Framework and that the calendar of formal meetings of the Burundi configuration would be established in consultation with the Government of Burundi and its partners so as to minimize any additional administrative requirements. The Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism had been designed in such a way as to facilitate coordination, prevent duplication with other existing frameworks and avoid overloading the Burundian authorities with new, non-essential requirements. The Commission should be kept abreast of developments, while giving actors on the ground the time needed to do their work.

28. The main challenge during the Mechanism's implementation would be to establish the right relationship between the Strategic Framework and the other strategies in which Burundi was involved. In particular, the appropriate connection should be made with PRSP indicators and benchmarks when assessing progress in implementing the Strategic Framework. Monitoring and tracking must also be seen as a continuous process. The matrix and the biannual progress reports would be key instruments in that regard. Ideally, the process would ensure a smooth and regular flow of information between New York and the field. The Peacebuilding Support Office, in coordination with the United Nations system, would make an essential contribution in that connection. The Commission must also be ready to react promptly and effectively to any obstacles that arose in the peacebuilding process and to address them in cooperation with the Burundian Government and relevant stakeholders. Lastly, to be effective, monitoring efforts should be led by national institutions, be truly inclusive of all segments of society and benefit from the cooperation of international partners. The Burundian Government and the Commission could count on the European Community in that regard.

29. **Mr. Harvey** (United Kingdom) said he welcomed the adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism, but stressed that it marked the beginning, not the end, of the process. The challenge now was to implement those commitments. Commission members

should not merely attend the biannual high-level meetings, but should focus on what they could do, individually and collectively, to help the Burundian Government in the priority areas that had been identified. It should also be remembered that the process would be an iterative one. The Commission should continue to reflect on the appropriateness of the benchmarks, indicators and commitments that had been established and adjust them as it gained experience.

30. **Mr. Kleib** (Indonesia) said that the adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism demonstrated stakeholders' commitment to consolidating peace in Burundi and proved that constructive engagement could lead to tangible results. The Mechanism was, however, just the first step in establishing close cooperation between the Burundian Government and the relevant international stakeholders. Its effectiveness would depend on its ability to adequately address the country's post-conflict challenges. To that end, it must be flexible; enjoy a strong sense of national ownership; be modified in response to the reality on the ground; and meet the Burundian Government's concerns. Otherwise, it could not produce tangible results. After all, it was the Burundian Government that was responsible for ensuring that progress was made and the Burundian people who would demand accountability from their Government.

31. As a developing country, Indonesia understood how difficult it was for Burundi to implement key reforms. The relevant stakeholders played a critical role in helping the Government build a stable, just and prosperous State and must therefore maintain their engagement over the long term. In that regard, the purpose of the matrix was twofold: it would facilitate the implementation of mutual engagements and encourage national and international stakeholders to assist Burundi in its peacebuilding and development efforts. Lastly, he reiterated his Government's strong support for the process.

32. **Mr. Wegter** (Netherlands) said that the Strategic Framework and its Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism would ensure that critical areas for peacebuilding in Burundi were addressed properly. He assured the Commission of his Government's support in implementing the Framework and applying the Mechanism appropriately and at all levels. The phase now beginning was the most important one thus far. To ensure that the Commission lived up to expectations and made a real difference in Burundi, all those involved must consider how best to support the implementation of the commitments identified, bearing in mind differences in both capacity and expertise.

33. **Ms. Hulan** (Canada) said she agreed that it was important to avoid the over-bureaucratization of the next phase in peacebuilding efforts in Burundi, but stressed that the Strategic Framework's implementation would require an unprecedented degree of cooperation among stakeholders on the ground. Despite the considerable preparations already made, continued vigilance on the ground would still be required in the months ahead. Those countries not represented in Bujumbura would rely heavily on assessments by the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General and other partners in that regard.

34. She also welcomed the regularization of Burundi configuration meetings. Her delegation considered two meetings a year to be a good starting point, but would also support a flexible arrangement whereby meetings could be held as and when required, in line with assessments coming out of Bujumbura. Generally speaking, though, her delegation welcomed the shift to a lighter meeting schedule and lighter oversight role and supported the Executive Representative's call for future Burundi configuration meetings to be guided by the Strategic Framework.

35. **Mr. Doraiswami** (India), stressing that the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism was a living document, said that the Commission must not only respond to developments on the ground, but also be as flexible as possible in New York. National ownership was also key. The implementation of the Mechanism was not an objective in itself, but a collective enterprise aimed primarily at expanding the capacity of the Burundian Government. It must, therefore, proceed at a speed with which the Government and relevant stakeholders on the ground were comfortable.

36. The shift in focus from New York to the field did not mean that the Commission could now hibernate between reports. Rather, it should think creatively about its role in areas within its mandate, which included the marshalling of resources and the provision of expert advice in areas identified by the Burundian Government. Lastly, close coordination among United Nations funds and programmes on the ground was essential to ensure that the Commission received clear guidance.

37. **Mr. Andereya** (Chile) said that the fact that the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism represented a consensus between the Government of Burundi, civil society and the international community made it a mutually-owned process. He hoped that it would serve as a model in future cases. In order to be effective, the Mechanism must be implemented in a flexible manner, according to experience on the ground. It must also be modified as and when necessary. After all, the final objective was to build peace and accelerate reconciliation and socio-economic development in Burundi.

38. **Mr. El Shinawy** (Egypt) said that the Commission should be kept informed of all developments on the ground, especially in relation to national reconciliation. He emphasized his delegation's support for the points contained in paragraph 10 of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism document, namely, that the Monitoring and Evaluation Group would review and update the indicators periodically and that the Commission had merely taken note of the current version of the matrix, until a revised version was jointly agreed.

39. **Mr. Mahiga** (United Republic of Tanzania) noted with satisfaction that the Commission was aligning its work with the PRSP. The two should go hand in hand to ensure complementarity. In that regard, he hoped that steps would be taken to create synergies between the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism, the PRSP and the various United Nations entities working on the ground.

40. His Government had been very pleased when the Commission had decided to take up the cause of Burundi and was very encouraged by the resources that had been mobilized for both peacebuilding and the ongoing Poverty Reduction Strategy process in Burundi. The United Republic of Tanzania would continue to be part of the peace process, together with other neighbouring countries. By consolidating peace, the international community would encourage the people of Burundi to overcome the few remaining political obstacles to bringing the Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu-Forces nationales de libération (PALIPEHUTU-FNL) into the peace process. He encouraged the Commission members and all other partners to continue the current positive trend. The Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism was just the beginning. His Government would follow the situation closely and, as one of Burundi's neighbours, offer the necessary assistance whenever required.

41. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that the adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism could only impact positively on Burundi's efforts to achieve economic recovery and consolidate peace. The Commission's future work should be guided by results on the ground and tangible improvements in conditions in Burundi. In addition to its engagement with the Commission, his Government would consider other ways of providing further assistance and cooperation to the Government of Burundi and looked forward to working with its partners in New York and Bujumbura.

42. **Mr. Antonio** (Angola) agreed that it was time to move from theory to action. Above all, it was important to demonstrate flexibility when implementing the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism. He welcomed the comments made by the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General in that regard, particularly since Burundi was still in a conflict situation and unforeseen developments were, therefore, always a possibility.

43. **Mr. Wolfe** (Jamaica) said he welcomed the adoption of the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism and endorsed the comments made by previous speakers. His delegation was aware of the ongoing political difficulties regarding the full implementation of the peace agreement, but stressed that Burundi was beset by serious economic constraints too. Monitoring and tracking activities must give equal attention to both, for without sustained economic recovery and development in Burundi, there could be no sustainable peace.

44. **The Chairperson** said that the current meeting marked a turning point in the Commission's engagement with Burundi. Its efforts would now be fully invested in implementing the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi and, in particular, in taking concrete actions to fulfil mutual engagements, as reflected in the Framework. The Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism would be the Commission's road map in that regard. The biannual formal meetings, possible field visits and other follow-up activities would represent key events in its engagement with Burundi. He expressed appreciation to Commission members for participating in such an important meeting. He looked forward to a continued active partnership in support of the consolidation of peace in Burundi.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.